

REMARKS

1. Status of Present Application

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action (Paper No. 2) mailed September 10, 2003. Upon entry of the above listed claim amendments, Claims 21-40 remain pending in the present application. More specifically, Claims 1-20 have been canceled, without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer of the subject matter therein, and Claims 21-40 have been newly added, which include independent claims 21, 30, and 36. The specification has also been amended to correct informalities and typographical errors. It is believed that these amendments do not add any new matter to the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 21-40 are respectfully requested.

2. Examiner Interview

Applicants and the undersigned wish to thank the Examiner for the time and consideration given during the telephonic interview on December 3, 2003. Applicants understand from the telephonic interview that the Examiner reviewed Applicants' draft claim amendments and believed that the draft amendments were going in a direction that would distinguish them from the prior art of record, particularly Doyle et al. Applicants have revised the draft claim amendments, which are submitted with this Response, to adopt the claim language the Examiner suggested to further clarify the distinctions of the claims over the prior art of record. Therefore, Applicants earnestly believe that the pending Claims 21-40 have been placed in condition for allowance, *at least*, with respect to the prior art of record in the Office Action.

3. Explanation of Claim Amendments

As discussed above, Applicants have amended the claims by canceling Claims 1-20, without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer of the subject matter therein, and adding new Claims 21-40, which include independent Claims 21, 30, and 36. Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing claim amendments were not made in response to the cited references or the claim rejections set forth in the instant Office Action. Thus, notwithstanding these items, Applicants have amended the claims to further clarify and define the patentable aspects of the present

invention in an earnest effort to expedite the prosecution of the presently pending application and claims to allowance. Moreover, the newly added claims are distinguished from the cited references in the discussion of section 7 below to support that the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

4. Response to Objections to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the Abstract of the Disclosure because of the perceived omission of the term "to" in the first sentence. As set forth in the above Amendments to the Specification, Applicants have amended the Abstract in a manner that is believed to accommodate the Examiner's objection.

The Examiner also objected to the specification due to the omission of trademark notations relative to the terms "Microsoft Word" and "Lotus Notes." As set forth in the above Amendments to the Specification, Applicants have amended all occurrences of these terms in the Specification to indicate the trademark status in accordance with M.P.E.P. § 608.01(v). Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

5. Response to Claim Objection

The Examiner objected to Claim 6 due to a term omission informality. However, as discussed in the above remarks (see e.g., section 3), Applicants have amended the claims by canceling Claims 1-20 and adding new Claims 21-40. The new Claims 21-40 do not include the informality raised in the objection. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing claim objection has become moot in light of the claim amendments.

6. Response to Claim Rejections

In the instant Office Action, the Examiner set forth the following claim rejections: (1) Claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Doyle et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,838,906); (2) Claims 5-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doyle et al. in view of Sakamura et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,170,474); and (3) Claims 16-20 as being unpatentable over Doyle et al. in view of Tolin et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,371,674).

In light of the cancellation of Claims 1-20, however, Applicants respectfully submit the foregoing claim rejections have become moot.

7. Distinctions of New Claims from the Cited References

As discussed above, Applicants have added new Claims 21-40, which include independent Claims 21, 30, and 36, to further clarify and define the patentable aspects of the present invention in an earnest effort to expedite the prosecution of the presently pending application and claims to allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that in light of the references cited in the instant Office Action, newly added Claims 21-40 are in condition for allowance for at least the following reasons and distinctions.

A. Independent Claim 21

Newly added independent Claim 21 recites the following:

Claim 21. (New) A method for accessing multiple types of electronic content, comprising:

receiving a request for a computer program to process an input to obtain an output comprising a type of content that is unknown to the computer program;

selecting at least one segment of computer code from a plurality of segments of computer code that will enable the computer program to process the input, when the at least one segment of computer code is executed along with the computer program, to provide the output comprising the type of content that is unknown to the computer program; and

executing the at least one segment of computer code along with the computer program to process the input and obtain the output comprising the type of content that is unknown to the computer program,

wherein the plurality of segments of computer code and the at least one segment of computer code are not executable as an independent computer program.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Doyle et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,838,906) (hereinafter, *Doyle*), Sakamura et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,170,474) (hereinafter, *Sakamura*), nor Tolin et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,371,674) (hereinafter, *Tolin*) individually or in any combination anticipate or render obvious independent Claim 21. This is because of at least the reason that none of these references individually or in any combination disclose, teach, or suggest, either

implicitly or explicitly, all elements, features, and/or steps of Claim 21. For example, these references individually or in any combination do not disclose, teach, or suggest “*selecting at least one segment of computer code from a plurality of segments of computer code that will enable the computer program to process the input, when the at least one segment of computer code is executed along with the computer program, to provide the output comprising the type of content that is unknown to the computer program*” as recited in Claim 21.

Regarding *Doyle*, this reference discloses a system allowing a user of a browser program on a computer connected to an open distributed hypermedia system to access and execute an embedded program object. The program object is embedded into a hypermedia document much like data objects. The user may select the program object from the screen. Once selected, the program object executes on the user's (client) computer or may execute on a remote server or additional remote computers in a distributed processing arrangement. After launching the program object, the user is able to interact with the object as the invention provides for ongoing interprocess communication between the application object (program) and the browser program. See e.g., *Doyle* at column 6, line 50, to column 7, line 42.

Thus, *Doyle* merely discloses a system for a first computer program (i.e., a browser) to cause a second computer program to launch and execute a program object (e.g., an image file) which can be accessed using the first program. This system by *Doyle* is similar to a web browser program that is configured to call on a separate program (e.g., a document viewer) in response to the selection of a particular embedded object (e.g., a hyper-link to an image file), thereby allowing the object to be accessed in the web browser program by communicating with the separate program, which is actually executing the object. A good example of such a system is the use of the Adobe[®] Reader[®] document viewer program and the Microsoft[®] Internet Explorer web browser program. See <http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/> and <http://www.microsoft.com/windows/ie>. That is, similar to the discussion in *Doyle* at column 15, lines 1-48, a user can configure the Microsoft[®] Internet Explorer program to launch the Adobe[®] Reader[®] program if certain objects in a web browser document (e.g., in HTML) are selected (i.e., executed), such as an embedded hyperlink object for a portable document format (PDF) file.

However, in very distinct contrast to *Doyle*, aspects of the present invention according to Claim 21 involve the execution of one or more segments of computer code (that are not

executable as an independent computer program) along with a computer program to enable the computer program to output a type of content that is not known to the computer program. For example, as discussed in the present application, a word processing program may receive a command to translate a word from English to French, where French language words are an unknown type of content to the word processing program. In accordance with Claim 21, one or more segments of computer code can be selected and executed along with the word processing program to translate the word from the known English language content type to a French language content type, which is not known for access by the word processing program. See e.g., present application at page 14, line 10, to page 15, line 3. Many other examples will be apparent to those skilled in the art.

Regarding *Sakamura*, this reference discloses a method for searching the memory of a data processing apparatus including a decoder for decoding the contents of an instruction and an execution unit for executing, which is performed in response to an instruction based on an output from the decoder. The search instruction identifies a desired data storage area from a plurality of data storage areas in the memory, which includes an array data structure. See e.g., *Sakamura* at column 1, line 60, to column 2, line 36. Thus, *Sakamura* does not disclose the aspects of the invention according to Claim 21.

Regarding *Tolin*, this reference discloses a machine translation system having a natural language source module for accepting externally introduced text in the source language. The system is broadly based upon the concept of Chaos and conducts a divergent search in the source language, a morpheme root database, and further includes a morphological word stripping means that is to be implemented on a data processing device. The system source module provides the steps whereby each of the words in a subject clause, phrase, or sentence of the externally introduced source language text are individually compared first to data in a lexical database. If the individual words are not found among the data in the lexical database, then the words are subjected to the morphological word stripping means. The morphological word stripping means are directed to the affixes of the words and first to the stripping of suffixes, if any, from each word. This is followed by the step of comparing an individual stripped word, in the absence of that particular word's stripped suffix, with the data in the morpheme root database. This comparison normally proceeds downward through descending length character strings until a morpheme root match is found. The stripping and comparison with the database are repeated as

often as required to find a root match. See e.g., *Tolin* at column 2, line 59, to column 4, line 11. Thus, *Tolin* also does not disclose the aspects of the invention according to Claim 21.

Based on at least the foregoing distinctions between aspects of the present invention according to Claim 21 and the disclosures of the cited references, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 21 is patentable over the references of *Doyle*, *Sakamura*, or *Tolin* individually or in any combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 21 is in condition for allowance.

B. Dependent Claims 22-29

Applicants respectfully submit that newly added dependent Claims 22-29 are patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above for the patentability of respective independent Claim 21 since they comprise the same elements, features, and/or steps as independent Claim 21. (Citations omitted). However, Applicants submit that these claims include additional elements, features, and/or steps that also have patentable significance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 22-29 are in condition for allowance.

C. Independent Claim 30

Newly added independent Claim 30 recites the following:

Claim 30. (New) A computer system for accessing multiple types of electronic content, comprising:

- a processing unit;
- a memory in communication with the processing unit; and
- a computer program stored in the memory that provides instructions to the processing unit, wherein the processing unit is responsive to the instructions, operable for:

identifying a plurality of segments of computer code that can be executed along with the computer program by the processing unit in response to the instructions;

selecting, in response to an input command to access at least one type of content that the computer program is not configured to access, at least one segment of computer code from the plurality of segments of computer code that can be executed along with the computer program by the processing unit, in response to the instructions, to access the at least one type of content that the computer program is not configured to access; and

executing the at least one segment of computer code along with the computer program to access the at least one type of content that the computer program is not configured to access,

wherein the plurality of segments of computer code and the at least one segment of computer code are not executable as an independent computer program.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Doyle*, *Sakamura*, nor *Tolin* individually or in any combination anticipate or render obvious independent Claim 30 for at least the reason that none of these references individually or in any combination disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly or explicitly, all elements, features, and/or steps of Claim 30. For example, these references individually or in any combination do not disclose, teach, or suggest “*selecting, in response to an input command to access at least one type of content that the computer program is not configured to access, at least one segment of computer code from the plurality of segments of computer code that can be executed along with the computer program by the processing unit, in response to the instructions, to access the at least one type of content that the computer program is not configured to access*” as recited in Claim 30.

Applicants respectfully submit that, based on at least the distinctions of the references discussed above with respect to Claim 21 (see Section 7-A), independent Claim 30 is patentable over *Doyle*, *Sakamura*, or *Tolin* individually or in any combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 30 is in condition for allowance.

D. Dependent Claims 31-35

Applicants respectfully submit that newly added dependent Claims 31-35 are patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above for the patentability of respective independent Claim 30 since they comprise the same elements, features, and/or steps as independent Claim 30. (Citations omitted). Moreover, Applicants submit that these claims include additional elements, features, and/or steps that also have patentable significance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 31-35 are in condition for allowance.

E. Independent Claim 36

Newly added independent Claim 36 recites the following:

Claim 36. (New) A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for accessing multiple types of electronic content, comprising:

logic for creating a list that comprises information about a plurality of segments of computer code that can be executed along with a computer program;

logic for choosing at least one segment of computer code from the plurality of segments of computer code, based on the information in the list, that can be executed along with the computer program to process a type of data that the computer program is not designed to process;

logic to execute the at least one segment of computer code along with the computer program in response to an input to provide an output of the type of data that the computer program is not designed to process,

wherein the plurality of segments of computer code and the at least one segment of computer code are not executable as an independent computer program.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither the reference of *Doyle*, *Sakamura*, nor *Tolin* individually or in any combination anticipate or render obvious independent Claim 36 for at least the reason that none of these references individually or in any combination disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly or explicitly, all elements, features, and/or steps of Claim 36. For example, these references individually or in any combination do not disclose, teach, or suggest “*logic for choosing at least one segment of computer code from the plurality of segments of*

computer code, based on the information in the list, that can be executed along with the computer program to process a type of data that the computer program is not designed to process” as recited in Claim 36.

Applicants respectfully submit that, based on at least the distinctions of the references discussed above with respect to Claim 21 (see Section 7-A), independent Claim 36 is also patentable over *Doyle*, *Sakamura*, or *Tolin* individually or in any combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 36 is also in condition for allowance.

F. Dependent Claims 37-40

Applicants respectfully submit that newly added dependent Claim 37-40 are patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above for the patentability of respective independent Claim 36 since they comprise the same elements, features, and/or steps as independent Claim 36. (Citations omitted). Applicants also submit that Claim 37-40 include additional elements, features, and/or steps that have patentable significance as well. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claim 37-40 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the objections and rejections set forth in the instant Office Action have been accommodated or rendered moot. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that, in light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the present application and all pending claims 21-40 are in condition for allowance.

The foregoing amendments and remarks are submitted as a full and complete response to the non-Final Office Action mailed September 10, 2003. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at 404.572.2570.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles E. Thorpe, Jr.
Reg. No. 48,782

King & Spalding LLP
45th Floor
191 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
404.572.2570

K&S Docket No. 06576-105006 (MS#146858.1)
(SPW/CET)